

REMARKS

Claims 13 and 16-47 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belotserkovsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,621,857; hereinafter "Belotserkovsky") in view of Frank et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,731,622; hereinafter "Frank") and Schuster et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,591,355; hereinafter "Schuster"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Independent claim 13 recites "A time-sliced processor ... comprising: a master control unit including a time slot table and a partial sum table for any time slot granularity; a data cache ..." Similarly, independent claim 28 recites "A master control unit in a time-sliced processor ... wherein the master control unit configures and controls the data cache and the signal processing elements for any time slot granularity." Similarly, independent claim 37 recites "A time-sliced processor ... comprising ...a master control means ... for configuring and controlling the data cache and the signal processing means for any time slot granularity."

Although Frank discloses data processing at chip or sub-chip resolution, the data processing is not a time-sliced based operation. Fig. 9 shows no support for context switching and data caching. Col. 13 line 13, through col. 14, line 32, and col. 2, lines 1-14, describe processing at sub-chip resolution, but do not suggest performing context switching and data caching.

Context switching and data caching at chip or sub-chip resolution is essential to the claimed time-slice based processing. Time-slice based processing pauses an ongoing process at a time slice boundary, switches to some other processing, and resumes the processing later on by reloading the stored context and data in cache. To a person of ordinary skill in the art, it would not have been obvious from Frank's disclosure of performing sub-chip resolution processing to arrive at the claimed time-slice based processing.

Frank mentions the term "time slot." However, "time slot" in Frank is mentioned in the context of the 3GPP WCDMA standard, which has a specific and different definition than "time slot" as used in the context of the claimed time-sliced processing.

Belotserkovsky and Schuster fail to make up for Frank's deficiencies.

Thus, independent claims 13, 28, and 37, along with their dependent claims, are patentable over the applied references for at least these reasons. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the prior art rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

In the event a fee is required or if any additional fee during the prosecution of this application is not paid, the Patent Office is authorized to charge the underpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2215.

Dated: January 3, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By *Laura C. Brutman*

Laura C. Brutman

Registration No.: 38,395

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 277-6500

Attorney for Applicant